DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 900 EC 113 598

AUTHOR	Smith, Glenn; Cummings, Veda
TITLE	State Practices in Managing Part B Funds. A Report of Survey Information Collected by the National Office.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 78
NOTE	33p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, The National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., 1201 16th Street, N.W., Suite 610-E, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00, prepaid)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agencies; Grants; *Handicapped Children; Inservice Education; *Management; *School Funds; *State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Local Education Agency

ABSTRACT

The document summarizes data collected from 40 State Education Agency Part B administrators responding to a survey asking states to report information relative to the Local Education Agency application process, management of flo-thru of Part B funds, management of incentive grant funds, use of discretionary Part B funds, and promotion of inservice training through Part B funds. Tables listing individual state responses and some summary comments are provided. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED166900

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE PRACTICES IN MANAGING PART B FUNDS

A REPORT OF SURVEY INFORMATION
COLLECTED BY THE NATIONAL OFFICE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION

1201 16TH ST., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

JUNE, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NASDSE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC113590

PREFACE

This is a summary of information collected from 40 SEA Part B administrators who responded to a NASDSE survey mailed in April 1978.

The survey asked states to report information relative to the LEA application process, managing the flo-thru of Part B funds, managing incentive grant funds, use of discretionary Part B funds, and promotion of inservice training through Part B funds.

Individual state responses are reported on the following pages, as well as some summary comments on page 1.

It is hoped that the information presented on the following pages will be helpful to all SEA personnel in comparing individual practices and policies with those of other states and to better understand the status of Part B nationally.

We extend our appreciation to the persons in the SEAs who responded to the survey and to the following 15 SEA persons from nine SEAs who developed the survey instrument at the conclusion of a 2-day siminar in Chicago in March on managing Part B funds: Ronald Ross, New York; Linda Pauley, Wisconsin; Margaret Niederer, Gail Lieberman, Jim Stowell, Mike Kotner, Gloria Calovini, Joe Fisher, Julie Carter, Illinois; Gary Makuch, Pennsylvania; Joe Todd, Ohio; Randy Morris, South Dakota; Chuck Essigs, Arizona; Joyce Eckrem, California; Lynn Frank, Texas.

James R. Galloway
Executive Director

This information was collected, tabulated and summarized by Glenn Smith and Veda Cummings of NASDSE.

SUMMARY DATA

Flo-Thru Funds

- The percentage of flo-thru dollars to LEAs ranged from fifty percent to ninety percent of the state's total allotment. Half of the states indicated a 50% flo-thru to LEAs.

- The number of LEA applications for flo-thru dollars in the states ranged from 24 to 616. Almost half of the states had less than 100 LEA applications. Six states had more than 200 LEA applications.

LEA Application Characteristics

- Half of the states reporting require LEAs to submit attachments with their Part B applications.

- Eleven SEAs set priority areas (other than 1st or 2nd priority children) for LEAs to address in their applications.

- Three states report no deadline or set date for LEA application forms to be submitted to the SEA. The "turn around" for LEAs to submit LEA applications to the SEA varied from two months to seven months to no time limit.

- Twenty states defined "related services" for LEAs the same as in P.L. 94-142

- The number of pages of LEA application forms ranged from two pages to 87 pages.

- Almost half of the responding SEAs indicated that the number of pages of the application form sent to the LEA was less than ten pages.

- Almost all of the reporting SEAs plan to tie the LEA application form to the state monitoring process.

Approval Process

- The number of SEA staff reviewing LEA applications ranged from one to 30 persons

- The length of time for SEA staff to review an LEA application form ranged from 15 minutes to two months

SUMMARY DATA

Flo-Thru Funds

- The percentage of flo-thru dollars to LEAs ranged from fifty percent to ninety percent of the state's total allotment. Half of the states indicated a 50% flo-thru to LEAs.

- The number of LEA applications for flo-thru dollars in the states ranged from 24 to 616. Almost half of the states had less than 100 LEA applications. Six states had more than 200 LEA applications.

LEA Application Characteristics

- Half of the states reporting require LEAs to submit attachments with their Part B applications.

- Eleven SEAs set priority areas (other than 1st or 2nd priority children) for LEAs to address in their applications.

- Three states report no deadline or set date for LEA application forms to be submitted to the SEA. The "turn around" for LEAs to submit LEA applications to the SEA varied from two months to seven months to no time limit.

- Twenty states defined "related services" for LEAs the same as in P.L. 94-142

- The number of pages of LEA application forms ranged from two pages to 87 pages.

- Almost half of the responding SEAs indicated that the number of pages of the application form sent to the LEA was less than ten pages.

- Almost all of the reporting SEAs plan to tie the LEA application form to the state monitoring process.

Approval Process

- The number of SEA staff reviewing LEA applications ranged from one to 30 persons

- The length of time for SEA staff to review an LEA application form ranged from 15 minutes to two months

- Predominantly, funds are disbursed on a quarterly basis to LEAs upon receipt of quarterly reports. One state disburses funds in advance.

Discretionary Funds

- Thirty SEAs set priorities or directions for LEAs for use of discretionary funds in 1977-78
- Thirty-one SEAs will set priorities or directions for use of discretionary funds in 1978-79
- Thirty-three SEAs specify in LEA applications that a certain percentage of "B" funds be designated for inservice training

Incentive Grant Funds

- Sixteen SEAs described their use of Incentive Grant funds for 1977-78 as "earmarked projects"
- Sixteen SEAs request LEAs to submit project grants
- Five SEAs flo-thru funds to LEAs based on child count

Inservice Training

- Twenty SEAs utilize up to 10% of their Part B LEA flo-thru dollars for inservice training (statewide)
- Five SEAs utilize between 11-20% of their Part B LEA flo-thru dollars for statewide inservice training
- Twenty of the SEAs earmarked up to 12% of their SEA discretionary Part B allotment for inservice training

TABLE 1

	Total Part B Dollars for 77-78	Percent of Flo-thru to LEAs	Number of Applications Which Will Apply for Flo-thru Dollars
ALABAMA	3,776,496	75%	127
ALASKA	490,568	50%	28
ARIZONA	2,500,000	75%	110
ARKANSAS	1,829,000	50%	350
CALIFORNIA	23,000,000	50%	194
COLORADO	plan not approved		
CONNECTICUT	4,000,000	50%	180
DELAWARE	778,000	70%	25
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	668,846		
FLORIDA	8,000,000 ant.	50%	67
GEORGIA	6,200,200	75%	187
GUAM	650,183	75%	
IDAHO	889,000	50%	89
ILLINOIS	16,500,000	50%	83
INDIANA	5,800,000	65%	61
IOWA	3,293,313	71%	15
KANSAS	2,571,064	50%	56
KENTUCKY	3,772,525	90%	181
MAINE	1,430,099	50%	460
MARYLAND	5,108,366	50%	24
MASSACHUSETTS	8,442,226	60%	250
MINNESOTA	4,900,000	80%	100
MISSISSIPPI	2,300,000	65%	152
MISSOURI	6,400,000	50%	
NEW JERSEY	9,837,092	50%	347
NEW MEXICO	no plan submitted		
NORTH CAROLINA	6,519,459	73%	147
NORTH DAKOTA	671,532	72%	25
OHIO	---		616
OREGON	2,343,180	50%	210
RHODE ISLAND	1,046,913	55%	40
SOUTH CAROLINA	4,967,715	75%	92
SOUTH DAKOTA	698,646	50%	173
TENNESSEE	5,811,671	90%	148
TEXAS	15,522,152	50%	317
VERMONT	539,113	50%	57
VIRGINIA	5,296,653	75%	141
WASHINGTON	4,967,938	87%	80
WISCONSIN	4,348,000	50%	150
TRUST TERRITORY	732,554		

TABLE 2

	MONTH LEA APPLICATION FORM MAILED TO LEAS?	MONTH LEA APPLICATION MUST BE SUBMITTED TO SEA?
ALABAMA	April	May
ALASKA	March	May
ARIZONA	October	February
ARKANSAS	August	October
CALIFORNIA	March	May
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	April	September
DELAWARE	October	December
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	May	June
GEORGIA	March	July
GUAM		
IDAHO	January	April
ILLINOIS	April	July
INDIANA	April	July
IOWA	April	June
KANSAS	March	no deadline
KENTUCKY	May	August
MAINE	February	no deadline for entitlement
MARYLAND	April	June
MASSACHUSETTS	October	March
MINNESOTA	June	July or ASAP
MISSISSIPPI	June	no set date
MISSOURI	March	2 phases; phase 1 due April
NEW JERSEY	March	May
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	May	July-September
NORTH DAKOTA	March	May
OHIO	April	June
OREGON	April	August
RHODE ISLAND	May	July
SOUTH CAROLINA	November	May
SOUTH DAKOTA	April	July
TENNESSEE	May	July
TEXAS	April	May
VERMONT	March	May
VIRGINIA	March	May
WASHINGTON	March	June
WISCONSIN	May	perhaps July

	NUMBER OF PAGES of APPLICATION FORM SENT BY SEA TO LEA?	IS THERE A PLAN IN YOUR STATE TO TIE LEA APPLICATIONS TO THE MONITORING PROCESS?
ALABAMA	6	yes
ALASKA	12	yes
ARIZONA		yes
ARKANSAS	47	yes
CALIFORNIA	8	yes
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	9	yes
DELAWARE		yes
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	16	yes
GEORGIA	varies	yes
GUAM		no
IDAHO	5	yes
ILLINOIS	9	yes
INDIANA	22	yes
IOWA	15	yes
KANSAS	2	yes
KENTUCKY		yes
MAINE	7	yes
MARYLAND	32	yes
MASSACHUSETTS	12	yes
MINNESOTA	16	yes
MISSISSIPPI	7+ narrative	some parts
MISSOURI	6	yes
NEW JERSEY		yes
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	16	yes
NORTH DAKOTA	46	yes
OHIO	23	yes
OREGON	14	no
RHODE ISLAND		yes
SOUTH CAROLINA	64	no
SOUTH DAKOTA	6	yes
TENNESSEE	15	yes
TEXAS	7	yes
VERMONT	7	yes
VIRGINIA		yes
WASHINGTON	87	yes
WISCONSIN	14	yes

TABLE 3 (continued)

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR SEA REVIEW PROCESS FOR LEA APPLICATION APPROVAL, i.e., NUMBER OF SEA STAFF DOING REVIEW, LENGTH OF TIME FOR REVIEW OF ALL APPLICATIONS, CONTINGENCIES APPLIED WHEN APPLICATION IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE, PROCESS FOR DISBURSAL OF FUNDS

AL - Four SEA staff members review plan for total compliance, should any part not meet established standards, LEAs must rewrite plans

AK - checks priorities listed by LEA, when budget comes in to see that budget corresponds to priorities. Three FTEs and approximately 3 days. If priorities do not meet Federal regulations, letter is sent to LEA to revise priorities. Once project is approved, grant award is issued, if SEA has received its grant from OE

AZ - technical review by two staff members to assure compliance with regulations

AR - LEA submits to area supervisor; area supervisor approves; payments begin

CA - 30 staff; approximately 2 weeks; written notice; "grant award" notice

CT - SEA special education staff approve applications and inform grants unit of clearance for payment; all approved in FY 78 (some corrections were necessary): money flows like Title I

DE - Two staff members review applications; applications reviewed by the Advisory Committee; SEA staff works with LEA to make necessary changes; application submitted to State Director of Exceptional Children/Special Program Division, state supervisor of federal funds, Assistant State Superintendent for Instruction and State Board of Education for approval

FL - Individual staff review various components and complete checklist. Will involve approximately six staff for approximately one month. Discrepancies will be negotiated. Funds distributed on cash advance draw.

GA - 18 staff members, 30 day turn around, LEA provided technical assistance for revisions, funds released quarterly

ID - 3 staff/1 day/ rework non-allowable priorities by phone and initial changes prior to approval/ rework tentative budgets with final award figures by phone and with written modified budgets from LEAs prior to actual funding

IL - 20-30 staff; one week review in July, tentative approval with mandated update

IN - two staff; 1 1/2 hour for each application, to date all applications have been found in compliance. When an application is found to be in non-compliance an LEA will be given an opportunity for a hearing. If the hearing demonstrates that LEA is in non-compliance, funds will be withheld until there is no longer a failure to comply

IA - review by four staff persons, 1 month for review, final approval by State Board, 15 applicant agencies, modifications made when not in compliance, funds disbursed in advance on quarterly basis.

TABLE 3 (continued)

KS - Since 1974, LEAs have filed updated annually a local comprehensive plan which contains most of the legal requirements of an LEA application. The plans or updates thereof are reviewed between May 15 and August 1. Between August 1 and the following May, districts are subject to site visits. Two full-time staff handle this, as well as other compliance functions.

KY - Reviewed by office for federal programs. Approximately two weeks per application, two staff members, TA given for alternatives which will provide compliance

ME - One staff person reviews all applications unless request is not covered by guidelines; time varies from 15 minutes to two hours per application; LEA is notified by telephone and/or letter when there is a question that application is not in compliance; Department Finance Division distributes funds upon receipt of a list of LEAs to be paid, list submitted by Division of Special Education

MD - application review involves 3 to 5 persons, including the regional administrator. Review is usually accomplished within a month. When not in compliance, applications were returned with recommendations for change. Funds are disbursed upon receipt of quarterly reports.

MA - Regional SEA staff doing review/negotiation; 6 (+ additional reviewers)
Central SEA staff doing reviews; 2
Funds awarded contingent upon submission of revisions/information

MN - Two persons review, supervisor checks, one hour review if unique, 1/2 hour standard; application must be in compliance before funds are released, funds paid on quarterly basis.

MS - Six staff, about two months

MO - Six staff review, 4-6 weeks for process

NJ - Three man team; 45 days to review all applications, LEAs called for minor discrepancies, applications returned for major corrections, disapproval requires due process

NC - Twelve staff members participated in review; coordinator reviewed all proposals; meetings, telephone calls, and letters to LEA not in compliance; 73% of funds distributed to LEAs; grant award documents after project approved.

ND - SEA staff of four will review the plans; approval by July 1, 1978; reimbursement will begin in the fall.

OH - Four staff; 45 days, informed when not in compliance, no contingency, no monies

OR - Two persons; 1/2 hour review if application is in good shape; call district if application is not in compliance; send district an approval form and district applies to department's business office quarterly in order to receive monthly advance payments based on the districts stated needs for project funds

TABLE 3 (continued)

RI - SEA staff of five jointly reviews application; develops letter requesting clarification or additions if incomplete. Once plan is judged acceptable a grant award document is issued.

SC - The person within the SEA responsible for the education of the handicapped shall review the application and submit approval/disapproval to the LEA/IEU Application is marked either "approved as submitted" or "substantially approvable" "Disapproval" of an application shall be for purposes of ineligibility or non-compliane

SD - Seven staff review is simply to see if all assurances are there and budget is correct.

TN - State plan and Part B application sent to district office of SEA. Review and recommendation by district special education, other appropriate persons. If ok sent on to central office for final review and approval. If not approvable, district specialists work with LEA until it is approvable. Funds disbursed quarterly upon request by LEA.

TX - Each proposal read concurrently by a representative from Special Education Funding and a representative from Special Education Program - one month optimum turn around; applications in non-compliance to be negotiated; funds disbursed directly to LEA or coop upon approval.

VT - There will be nine persons reviewing local applications for approximately three days.

VA - Four reviewers per application; complete review take approximately two weeks LEA requested to make recommended review in specified time when application is not in compliance; funds are distributed by means of grant award letter to LEA.

WA - contracted 30 days for reader; LEA submitted modified application if reg.

WI - Unknown at this time. Funds will be disbursed on a reimbursement basis.

TABLE 4

	Does SEA Require LEA to Submit Attachments With the Application Form?	*Does SEA Set Priority Areas (other than 1st or 2nd Priority Children for LEAs to Address in Application)?
ALABAMA	Yes	No
ALASKA	Yes	No
ARIZONA		No
ARKANSAS	No	No
CALIFORNIA	No	No
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	No	No
DELAWARE	No	Yes
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	No	No
GEORGIA	Yes	No
GUAM	No	No
IDAHO	No	Yes
ILLINOIS	Yes	Yes
INDIANA	No	No
IOWA	Yes	No
KANSAS	No	Yes
KENTUCKY	Yes	No
MAINE	No	No
MARYLAND	No	Yes
MASSACHUSETTS	No	No
MINNESOTA	Yes	No
MISSISSIPPI	Yes	No
MISSOURI	Yes	No
NEW JERSEY	No	Yes
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	Yes	No
NORTH DAKOTA	No	Yes
OHIO	No	No
OREGON	Yes	No
RHODE ISLAND	Yes	No
SOUTH CAROLINA	No	No
SOUTH DAKOTA	Yes	No
TENNESSEE	No	No
TEXAS	Yes	Yes
VERMONT	Yes	Yes
VIRGINIA		Yes
WASHINGTON	Yes	Yes
WISCONSIN	Yes	No
TRUST TERRITORY		

*Description on next page

TABLE 4 (continued)

Does SEA Set Priority Areas (Other Than 1st or 2nd Priority Children for LEAs to Address in Application)?

DELAWARE - draft of priorities only

IDAHO - Idaho child find at LEA level

ILLINOIS - inservice education = 10%

KANSAS - preschool handicapped

MARYLAND - state priorities 1) 5-20 2) 3-4 3) 0-2

NEW JERSEY - preschool

NORTH DAKOTA - low incidence handicapped

TEXAS - SPH assessment, care and services

VERMONT - six general recommendations taken from P.L. 94-142

VIRGINIA - regular programs and programs for ED

TABLE 5

Which Term(s) Best Describe Your "LEA Application Packet" (you may check more than one)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Description of #7
ALABAMA							X	on next page
ALASKA		X				X	X	
ARIZONA		X	X				X	
ARKANSAS		X		X			X	
CALIFORNIA	X			X		X	X	
COLORADO								
CONNECTICUT		X		X			X	
DELAWARE		X		X			X	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
FLORIDA		X		X				
GEORGIA	X	X		X		X	X	
GUAM								
IDAHO		X	X					
ILLINOIS	X			X		X	X	
INDIANA	X			X			X	
IOWA	X	X	X	X		X		
KANSAS		X		X				
KENTUCKY	X	X		X		X	X	
MAINE		X		X				
MARYLAND	X		X				X	
MASSACHUSETTS	X	X	X				X	
MINNESOTA				X				
MISSISSIPPI	X			X				
MISSOURI	X	X					X	
NEW JERSEY	X	X		X				
NEW MEXICO								
NORTH CAROLINA	X	X		X			X	
NORTH DAKOTA		X		X			X	
OHIO		X		X			X	
OREGON				X				
RHODE ISLAND	X	X		X	X	X	X	
SOUTH CAROLINA		X		X			X	
SOUTH DAKOTA		X	X					
TENNESSEE				X				
TEXAS	X			X		X	X	
VERMONT	X			X				
VIRGINIA				X				
WASHINGTON		X	X					
WISCONSIN		X		X		X	X	
TRUST TERRITORY	X	X		X			X	

CODE:
1 = primarily descriptions written by LEA
2 = primarily assurances which LEA "signs off" on
3 = contains actual budget, without narrative
4 = contains budget with narrative description
5 = does not ask for budget information
6 = asks for attachments
7 = asks for LEA to supply certain data

TABLE 5 (continued)

7 = asks for LEA to supply certain data (please identify data requested)

ALABAMA - each LEA must develop a comprehensive plan covering each requirement of P.L. 94-142 and submit it as part of plan

ALASKA - priorities LEAs will address

ARIZONA - required by P.L. 94-142

ARKANSAS - students in priority areas; personnel and inservice

CALIFORNIA - data from February child count

GEORGIA - child identification; child receiving services

ILLINOIS - child information

INDIANA - detailed timetable; personnel summary sheet

KENTUCKY - numbers and types of children; personnel being paid under Part B

MARYLAND - tables for state plan

MASSACHUSETTS - objectives justifying equipment listing, project participant, coordination, evaluation, and dissemination activities

MISSOURI - LRE, inservice needs

NORTH CAROLINA - child find, staff development plan, objectives, activities and evaluation

NORTH DAKOTA - cooperative area plans for low incidence handicapped students

OHIO - LRE

SOUTH CAROLINA - number of pupils identified and served by handicapped areas, categorical and non-categorical personnel, facilities

TEXAS - full educational opportunity goal timetable and support data; data on placement in LRE

WISCONSIN - BEH form "Service and Needs by Priority Area" and "Primary Placement of Handicapped Children"

TABLE 6

	As of 3/15/78 Has Your Application Development, Submission, Review, Granting of Funds Cycle Been Completed for FY 78?	How Does Your State Define Related Services for LEAs?
ALABAMA	Yes	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
ALASKA	only 1st qtr. received	"
ARIZONA	Yes	"
ARKANSAS	Yes	"
CALIFORNIA	Yes	"
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	Yes	"
DELAWARE	Yes	fed. & state regs.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	No	consistent with state laws
GEORGIA	No	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
GUAM	No	(see attached)
IDAHO	Yes	(see attached)
ILLINOIS	Yes	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
INDIANA	No	"
IOWA	Yes	state rules for special ed
KANSAS	No	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
KENTUCKY	No	"
MAINE	No	(see attached)
MARYLAND	Yes	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
MASSACHUSETTS	Yes for LEAs, No for SEA	(see attached)
MINNESOTA	No	developing standards
MISSISSIPPI	No	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
MISSOURI	Yes	(see attached)
NEW JERSEY	No	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	No	"
NORTH DAKOTA	No	(see attached)
OHIO	No	state program standards
OREGON	No	(see attached)
RHODE ISLAND	No	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
SOUTH CAROLINA	No	"
SOUTH DAKOTA	Yes	"
TENNESSEE	No	(see attached)
TEXAS	No	same as P.L. 94-142 regs
VERMONT	No	"
VIRGINIA	Yes	
WASHINGTON	No	
WISCONSIN	No	transportation only
TRUST TERRITORY		

TABLE 6 (continued)

How Does Your State Define Related Services for LEAs?

GUAM - any service which is not normally offered through regular special education program

IDAHO - related services refers to transportation and such developmental corrective and other supportive services as are required to assist and exceptional child to benefit from special education and includes speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, early identification and assessment of disabilities in children, counseling services and medical services for diagnostic or evaluation purposes, school health services, social work services in school, parent counseling and training.

MAINE - educational evaluation, OT, PT, inservice training, provision of materials and supplies, minimum secretarial/clerical services

MASSACHUSETTS - unbudgeted services or services which improve, quantity, caliber or quality of services

MISSOURI - any special education service not defined as instruction

NORTH DAKOTA - PT. OT, transportation, contracted services, speech therapy, recreational therapy, equipment, those things necessary to support education in IEP

OREGON - any service which is not a direct service

TENNESSEE - services needed to enable child to take advantage of educational services

TABLE 7

	Does the SEA Set Priorities or Directions For Use of Discretionary Funds for		If yes, please describe
	1977-78	1978-79	
ALABAMA	Yes	Yes	
ALASKA	Yes	Yes	(descriptions on next page)
ARIZONA	Yes	Yes	
ARKANSAS	Yes	Yes	
CALIFORNIA	Yes	Yes	
COLORADO	Yes	Yes	
CONNECTICUT	Yes	Yes	
DELAWARE	Yes	Yes	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
FLORIDA	Yes	Yes	
GEORGIA	Yes	Yes	
GUAM	Yes	Yes	
IDAHO	No	No	
ILLINOIS	No	Yes	
INDIANA	Yes	Yes	
IOWA	Yes	Yes	
KANSAS	Yes	Yes	
KENTUCKY			
MAINE	Yes	Yes	
MARYLAND	Yes	Yes	
MASSACHUSETTS	Yes	Yes	
MINNESOTA	Yes	Yes	
MISSISSIPPI	Yes	Yes	
MISSOURI	No	Yes	
NEW JERSEY	Yes		
NEW MEXICO			
NORTH CAROLINA	Yes	Yes	
NORTH DAKOTA	No	No	
OHIO	Yes	Yes	
OREGON	Yes	Yes	
RHODE ISLAND			
SOUTH CAROLINA	Yes		
SOUTH DAKOTA	Yes	Yes	
TENNESSEE	No		
TEXAS	Yes	Yes	
VERMONT	Yes	Yes	
VIRGINIA	Yes	Yes	
WASHINGTON	Yes	Yes	
WISCONSIN	Yes	Yes	
TRUST TERRITORY	No	Yes	

TABLE 7 (continued)

Does the SEA Set Priorities or Directions for Use of Discretionary Funds? (Please Describe)

ALABAMA - 1st and 2nd as they relate to deaf-blind, severely handicapped and ED

ALASKA - earmarked for projects which attack greatest needs in state

ARKANSAS - child find for 77-78; regional programs for children with low incidence handicaps for 78-79

CALIFORNIA - unserved for 77-78; full service, personnel development, preschool and infant, MIS, comprehensive planning, career/voc. ed. special training for 78-79

CONNECTICUT - town must have declared itself to be a first priority town and plan to use funds for first priority children

FLORIDA - child find, learning resource centers, deaf-blind tutor

GEORGIA - innovative finds for 77-78; statewide projects, state responsibility for wards of state for 78-79

IOWA - unserved population, mainly preschool

KANSAS - second priority children, preschool

MAINE - first and second priority children

MARYLAND - in accordance with federal and state priorities

MASSACHUSETTS - unserved; secondary; early childhood; child find; interagency Boston Project; multi-service collaborative; state hospital programs

MISSISSIPPI - highest priority needs

NEW JERSEY - vocational education services for handicapped children, urban LEAs with 10% handicapped population

NORTH CAROLINA - 1st and 2nd priorities

OHIO - special educational regional resource centers, majority identification projects

OREGON - projects previously funded; projects serving 15 or more severely handicapped kids; concentrations of severely handicapped, low incidence and relatively expensive programs

TABLE 7 (continued)

TEXAS - direction services and direct services for severely and profoundly handicapped kids

WASHINGTON - assessment, parent training, teacher training

WISCONSIN - 1st and 2nd priorities

TABLE 8

Who May Apply for SEA Discretionary Funds?

ALABAMA - all Leas

ALASKA - eligible LEAs

ARIZONA - LEAs

ARKANSAS - LEAs in need of child search coordinator

CALIFORNIA - district with newly identified unserved; SEARCH regional units; district for local SEARCH

CONNECTICUT - LEAs who have declared themselves 1st priority

DELAWARE - any LEA

FLORIDA - LEAs

GEORGIA - open statewide

IDAHO - any LEA may request excess cost funds to provide for individual child's needs

ILLINOIS - LEAs, REAs, and universities

INDIANA - all LEAs - earmarked for VI-B priority 1 continuation projects

IOWA - any IEU

KANSAS - any public school district

KENTUCKY - still being considered

MAINE - all LEAs

MARYLAND - all LEAs

MASSACHUSETTS - anyone

MINNESOTA - by governor's planning region (9)

MISSISSIPPI - not handled in that manner

MISSOURI - LEAs

NEW JERSEY - all LEAs

NORTH CAROLINA - LEAs

TABLE 8 (continued)

NORTH DAKOTA - LEAs, county or multi-county units

OHIO - any school district

OREGON - selected by SEA

RHODE ISLAND - not divided

SOUTH CAROLINA - state operated programs who submitted child count for school-age children

SOUTH DAKOTA - LEAs and coops

TENNESSEE - all funds other than administrative are going to LEAs as entitlement

TEXAS - regional education service centers

VERMONT - SEA determines need

VIRGINIA - LEAs

WASHINGTON - ESDs

WISCONSIN - LEAs and Wisconsin IEUs (cooperative education service agencies)

TABLE 9

INCENTIVE GRANT FUNDS

	Which Best Describes the SEA Use of Incentive Grant Funds for 1977-78 in Your State		
	SEA Earmarked Projects	Project Grants Submitted by LEAs	Flo-thru to LEAs Based on Child Count
ALABAMA	no Incentive Funds		
ALASKA		X	
ARIZONA	no program		
ARKANSAS			X
CALIFORNIA		X	
COLORADO			
CONNECTICUT	X		
DELAWARE	X		
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	X		
FLORIDA			X
GEORGIA			X
GUAM	X		
IDAHO			X
ILLINOIS		X	
INDIANA	X		
IOWA	X	X	
KANSAS		X	
KENTUCKY	X		
MAINE		X	
MARYLAND	X		
MASSACHUSETTS	X		
MINNESOTA	X (after LEA needs assessment)		
MISSISSIPPI	no approved funds		
MISSOURI		X	
NEW JERSEY		X	
NEW MEXICO			
NORTH CAROLINA		X	
NORTH DAKOTA		X	
OHIO		X	
OREGON	X		
RHODE ISLAND		X	
SOUTH CAROLINA			X
SOUTH DAKOTA	X		
TENNESSEE		X	
TEXAS		X	
VERMONT	X		
VIRGINIA	X		
WASHINGTON	X	X	
WISCONSIN		X	
TRUST TERRITORY			

TABLE 9 (continued)

Please Describe the Process Used At SEA Level for Disbursal of Incentive Grant Funds.

ALASKA - granted to LEA with fledgling preschool program, designed to improve it and make it a pilot project that could be replicated throughout the state

ARKANSAS - We received it too late in the year for allocation this year

CALIFORNIA - grant award

CONNECTICUT - directive grant to an LEA capable of demonstrating/training in most points on the continuum of services for this age group 1978

DELAWARE - SEA determines priorities based upon availability of specific services statewide

FLORIDA - not yet developed

GEORGIA - funds released based on approved plan, one time payment

IDAHO - memo of agreements following application and assessment/instruction documentation

ILLINOIS - discretionary projects - RFP basis - to meet areas identified by a statewide task force

INDIANA - some application process, but service is limited to 3, 4 and 5 year old children. Funds are used primarily to start new programs in the above mentioned age range

KANSAS - incentive grants are tied to LEA participation in state implementation grant activities - i.e., interagency planning at local level for comprehensive services to preschool handicapped

KENTUCKY - FY 78 incentive grant funds are proposed to be used for a statewide, SEA directed preschool screening program

MARYLAND - In 1977-78, it was used for development of a Preschool Administrative Process and Control Manual for Local Supervisors and Parents of Handicapped 3-5. In 1978-79, it will flo-thru to LEAs based on child count.

MASSACHUSETTS - grant applications submitted to SEA for specific services. Also, the deployment of early childhood specialists throughout the state to provide technical assistance to LEAs in program areas

MISSOURI - identified priorities - accepted applications, make award.

NEW JERSEY - competitive RFPs

NORTH CAROLINA - review by panel of 10 readers - inside and outside SEA; recommendations used to choose projects; State Board of Education award approval to LEAs.

NORTH DAKOTA - will be distributed to existing preschool projects

OHIO - competitive prospectus, review panel, negotiation approval

OREGON - survey of counties with "Pockets" of severely handicapped preschoolers and selected six projects. Department worked closely with the Mental Health Division on preschool incentive grants

RHODE ISLAND - initially we had proposed straight flow-thru. FY 78 award was held in abeyance while new distribution is being studied.

SOUTH CAROLINA - Agencies submit a letter of intent, monies are reallocated to agencies indicating an intent to apply. Meeting is held of all professional staff and the expenditure and applications reviewed.

TEXAS - competitive project grants - proposals ought through RFP - standard review process to be followed

VIRGINIA - by contract

WASHINGTON - to ESD by child count

WISCONSIN - using Title VI-B process whereby an LEA submits a letter of intent which is presented to a committee for approval; upon approval the LEA is invited to write up a project application which is again approved by the same committee.

TRUST TERRITORY - only one LEA operate preschool for handicapped children. All the money from incentive grant is given to this LEA

TABLE 10

	Does Your SEA Designate In LEA Applications that a Certain Percentage of "B" Funds be Designated for Inservice Training?	If yes, please describe
ALABAMA	No	
ALASKA	No	
ARIZONA	No	
ARKANSAS	No	
CALIFORNIA	Yes	10%
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	No	
DELAWARE	No	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	No	
GEORGIA	No	
GUAM	N/A	
IDAHO	No	
ILLINOIS	Yes	10%; tied to meeting 1 & 2 priorities
INDIANA	No	
IOWA	No	
KANSAS	No	
KENTUCKY	No	
MAINE	No	
MARYLAND	No	
MASSACHUSETTS	No	
MINNESOTA	No	
MISSISSIPPI	No	
MISSOURI	No	
NEW JERSEY	No	
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	No	
NORTH DAKOTA	No	
OHIO	No	
OREGON	No	
RHODE ISLAND	No	
SOUTH CAROLINA	No	
SOUTH DAKOTA	No	
TENNESSEE	No	
TEXAS	No	
VERMONT	No	training is optional allowable cost
VIRGINIA	No	
WASHINGTON	Yes	reg. ed., preschool, principals
WISCONSIN	No	
TRUST TERRITORY	No	

TABLE 11

Estimate the Percentage of Part B Dollars (SEA and LEA Flo-Thru Funds) Being Utilized for Inservice Training

	% LEA Flo-thru for Inservice (Statewide)	% of SEA VI-B Allotment Other Than Flo-thru Spent for Inservice	Do LEA Applications Require That A Certain Amount or Percentage of VI-B Flo-Thru Dollars Be Spent for Specific Areas Other Than Inservice Training?
ALABAMA	10%	8%	No
ALASKA	20%	10%	No
ARIZONA	no data	5%	No
ARKANSAS	0%	2%	No
CALIFORNIA	20%	4%	No
COLORADO			
CONNECTICUT	10%	10%	No
DELAWARE	8%	5%	Yes
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
FLORIDA			No
GEORGIA	10%	30%	
GUAM		20%	No
IDAHO	20%	20%	No
ILLINOIS	10%	1%	No
INDIANA	3%	0%	No
IOWA	3%	2%	No
KANSAS		10%	No
KENTUCKY	15-20%		No
MAINE	10%	10%	No
MARYLAND	2%	1%	No
MASSACHUSETTS	10%	5%	Yes, evaluation to 5%
MINNESOTA	less than 1%	less than 1%	No
MISSISSIPPI			No
MISSOURI			No
NEW JERSEY			No
NEW MEXICO			
NORTH CAROLINA	5%	30%	No (child find 2%)
NORTH DAKOTA	5%	5%	Yes (evaluation 5%)
OHIO	0%	35%	No (unserved 10%)
OREGON	1%	20%	No
RHODE ISLAND		16%	No
SOUTH CAROLINA	5%		No
SOUTH DAKOTA		.03%	No
TENNESSEE			No
TEXAS			No
VERMONT	20%	10%	No
VIRGINIA	1%	9%	No
WASHINGTON	2%	5%	No
WISCONSIN			No
TRUST TERRITORY	10%	0%	No

SEA _____

Contact person in your SEA for

LEA application _____
Incentive Grant Funds _____
Part B Discretionary Dollars _____

Total Part B Dollars for 1977-78 _____

Percent of flo-thru to LEAs _____

Number of LEAs/IEUs/Coops which will submit applications for flo-thru funds _____

Does the SEA set priority areas other than first and second priority children for LEAs to address in the LEA application?

Yes No

If yes, please describe _____
_____
_____

Month your LEA application form was (will be) mailed to LEAs _____

Month LEA application must be submitted to SEA _____

Total number of pages of the application form sent by SEA to LEAs _____

Does SEA require LEA to submit attachments with the application form?

Yes No

Which term(s) best describe your "Lea application packet" (you may check more than one)

_____ primarily descriptions written by LEA
_____ primarily assurances which LEA "signs off" on
_____ contains actual budget, without narrative
_____ contains budget with narrative description
_____ does not ask for budget information
_____ asks for attachments
_____ asks for LEA to supply certain data (if yes, please identify data requested) _____
_____

Please briefly describe your SEA review process for LEA application approval, i.e., number of SEA staff doing review, length of time for review of all applications, contingencies applied when application is not in compliance, process for disbursal of funds _____
_____
_____

As of 3/15/78 has your application development, submission, review, granting of funds cycle been entirely completed for FY '78?

Yes No

How does your SEA define related services for LEAs? _____
_____
_____

Is there a plan in your state to tie LEA applications to the monitoring process?

Yes No

Incentive Grant Funds

Which best describes the SEA use of incentive grant funds for 1977-78 in your state?

_____ Sea earmarked projects
_____ project grants submitted by LEAs
_____ flo-thru to LEAs based on child count

Please describe the process used at SEA level for disbursal of incentive grant funds _____
_____
_____

Discretionary Part B Funds

Who may apply for LEA discretionary funds? _____
_____

Does the SEA set priorities or directions for use of discretionary funds for
1977-78 _____Yes _____No 1978-79 _____Yes _____No

Please describe _____
_____

Inservice Training

Does your SEA designate in LEA applications that a certain percentage of "B" funds be designated for inservice training?

Yes No

If yes, please describe _____
_____

Estimate the percentage of Part B dollars (SEA and LEA flo-thru) funds being utilized for inservice training

_____% LEA flo-thru for inservice (statewide)
_____% SEA VI-B allotment other than flo-thru spent for inservice

Do LEA applications require that a certain amount or percentage of VI-B flow-thru dollars be spent for specific areas other than inservice training?

Yes No

If yes, what areas and what percentage

_____	_____%
_____	_____%
_____	_____%
_____	_____%

CONTACT PERSON IN SEA FOR:	LEA APPLICATION	INCENTIVE GRANT FUNDS
ALABAMA	Earl Gates	Earl Gates
ALASKA	Lawrence L. Schutt	Lawrence L. Schutt
ARIZONA	Chuck Essigs	no program
ARKANSAS	Jack Morgan	Jack Morgan
CALIFORNIA	Joyce Eckrem	Don Keeney
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	Lester Horvath	Virginia Guldager
DELAWARE	Dr. Carl Haltom	Dr. Carl Haltom
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		Mrs. Margaret MacIver
FLORIDA	Wayne B. Largent	Wendy M. Cullar
GEORGIA	Janet M. Rosenbaum	Janet M. Rosenbaum
GUAM	William J. Sewell, Jr.	William J. Sewell, Jr.
IDAHO	Dr. Judy A. Schrag	Dr. Judy A. Schrag
ILLINOIS	L. James Stowell	L. James Stowell
INDIANA	Hank Binder	Pam Peterson
IOWA	John Lanham	Jean Clary
KANSAS	Betty Weithers	Betty Weithers
KENTUCKY	Jim DeSpain	Betty Bright
MAINE	Joseph W. Kern	Christine B. Bartlett
MARYLAND	Dr. Anthony P. Kowalski	Dr. Camille Peck
MASSACHUSETTS	Daniel McGonagle	Charlene Imhoff
MINNESOTA	Ms. Jo Gascoigne	Ms. Jo Gascoigne
MISSISSIPPI	Walter H. Moore	Walter H. Moore
MISSOURI	Lonnie Werner	Lonnie Werner
NEW JERSEY	Jose M. Alvarez	Charles Murray
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	James L. Barden	Sue King
NORTH DAKOTA	Dr. Janet Kuntz	Dr. Janet Kuntz
OHIO	Joseph H. Todd	
OREGON	Dale Skewis	Terry Kramer
RHODE ISLAND	Charles J. Harrington	Charles J. Harrington
SOUTH CAROLINA	Frances F. Boswell	Frances F. Boswell
SOUTH DAKOTA	Randy Morris	Kay Olson and George Levin
TENNESSEE	Marion H. Parr	Marion H. Parr
TEXAS	Jane Duckett	Jane Duckett
VERMONT	Murdo A. Campbell	Murdo A. Campbell
VIRGINIA	Austin Tuning	Jo Bunce
WASHINGTON		
WISCONSIN	John Stadtmueller	John Stadtmueller
TRUST TERRITORY	Ira Akapito	Ira Akapito

	PART B DISCRETIONARY DOLLARS	
ALABAMA	Earl Gates	
ALASKA	Lawrence L. Schutt	
ARIZONA	Chuck Essigs	
ARKANSAS	Jack Morgan	
CALIFORNIA	Bob Gartin	
COLORADO		
CONNECTICUT	David Murphy	
DELAWARE	Carl Haltom	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	Wayne Largent	
GEORGIA	Janet Rosenbaum	
GUAM	William J. Sewell, Jr.	
IDAHO	Dr. Judy A. Schrag	
ILLINOIS	L. James Stowell	
INDIANA	Hank Binder	
IOWA	John Lanham	
KANSAS	Betty Weithers	
KENTUCKY		
MAINE	Joseph W. Kerb	
MARYLAND	Jerry White	
MASSACHUSETTS	Edward Gotgart	
MINNESOTA	Jo Gascoigne	
MISSISSIPPI	Walter Moore	
MISSOURI	Lonnie Werner	
NEW JERSEY	Jose M. Alvarez	
NEW MEXICO		
NORTH CAROLINA	James Barden	
NORTH DAKOTA	Janet Kuntz	
OHIO		
OREGON	Jesse Fasold	
RHODE ISLAND	Charles J. Harrington	
SOUTH CAROLINA	Carolyn S. Boney	
SOUTH DAKOTA	Randy Morris and George Levin	
TENNESSEE	Marion H. Parr	
TEXAS	Jane Duckett	
VERMONT	Murdo A. Campbell	
VIRGINIA	Austin Tuning	
WASHINGTON		
WISCONSIN	John Stadtmueller	
TRUST TERRITORY	Ira Akapito	